

Article

British Gynaecological Cancer Society recommendations and guidance on patient-initiated follow-up (PIFU)

Newton, Claire, Nordin, Andy, Rolland, Philip, Ind, Thomas, Larsen-Disney, Peter, Martin-Hirsch, Pierre, Beaver, Kinta, Bolton, Helen, Peevor, Richard, Fernandes, Andrea, Kew, Fiona, Sengupta, Partha, Miles, Tracie, Buckley, Lynn, Manderville, Helen, Gajjar, Ketan, Morrison, Jo, Ledermann, Jonathan, Frost, Jonathan, Lawrence, Alexandra, Sundar, Sudha and Fotopoulou, Christina

Available at <https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/33173/>

Newton, Claire, Nordin, Andy, Rolland, Philip, Ind, Thomas, Larsen-Disney, Peter, Martin-Hirsch, Pierre, Beaver, Kinta orcid iconORCID: 0000-0002-6552-2323, Bolton, Helen, Peevor, Richard et al (2020) British Gynaecological Cancer Society recommendations and guidance on patient-initiated follow-up (PIFU). International Journal Of Gynecological Cancer, 30 (5). pp. 695-700. ISSN 1048-891X

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ijgc-2019-001176>

For more information about UCLan's research in this area go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/researchgroups/> and search for <name of research Group>.

For information about Research generally at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [policies](#) page.

1 ABSTRACT

2 The National Cancer Survivorship Initiative through the National Health Service (NHS)
3 improvement in the United Kingdom (UK) started the implementation of stratified pathways
4 of patient-initiated follow-up (PIFU) across various tumour types. Now the initiative is
5 continued through Living With and Beyond Cancer programme by NHS England.

6 Evidence from non-randomised studies and systematic reviews does not demonstrate a
7 survival advantage to the long-established practice of hospital-based follow-up ~~(FU)~~
8 regimens, traditionally over 5 years. Evidence shows that patient needs are inadequately
9 met under the traditional hospital-based follow-up FU programmes and there is ~~therefore~~
10 an urgent need-necessity to adapt pathways to the needs of patients. The assumption that
11 ~~hospital-based~~ hospital-based follow-up FU is able to detect cancer recurrences early and
12 hence improve patients' prognosis has not been validated. A recent survey demonstrates
13 that hospital-based follow-up FU practice across the UK varies widely, with telephone follow-
14 up FU clinics, nurse-led clinics, and PIFU becoming increasingly common.

15 There are currently no completed randomised controlled trials in ~~-PIFU~~ in gGynaecological
16 malignancies, although there is a drive towards implementing ~~PIFU~~it. PIFU aims to
17 individualise patient care, based on risk of recurrence and holistic needs, and optimising
18 resources. The British Gynaecology Cancer Society (BGCS) wishes to provide the
19 gynaecological oncology community with guidance and a recommendations' statement
20 regarding the value, indications and limitations of PIFU in endometrial, cervical, ovarian and
21 vulva cancers in an effort to standardise practice and improve patient care.

22 Key words: Patient initiated follow-up (PIFU), gGynaecology oOncology, ~~follow-up (FU)~~,
23 gGynaecological malignancies.

24 Precis: British Gynaecology Cancer Society (BGCS) recommendations' statement regarding
25 the value, indications and limitations of PIFU in endometrial, cervical, ovarian and vulvar
26 carcinoma

27

28 INTRODUCTION

29 The British Gynaecology Cancer Society (BGCS) has issued a number of guidelines to
30 improve the quality of care and standardise treatment and follow-up pathways for
31 patients with gynaecological cancer. As the practice of follow up varies widely¹
32 and is continuously evolving, the BGCS wished to implement strategies for a UK-wide
33 implementation of patient initiated follow-up (PIFU), addressing its indications, value and
34 limitations across all different gynaecological cancer sites. The National Cancer Survivorship
35 Initiative, through NHS improvement, has already implemented stratified pathways
36 (including some patient initiated) for follow up in breast, colorectal, and prostate
37 cancer². Patients with early stage cancer of breast, colorectal and prostate may be
38 offered remote surveillance and at the present time no surveillance techniques have been
39 deemed to be effective in gynaecological cancers.

40 Historically, patients have been kept on hospital-based follow up in dedicated outpatient
41 clinics for 5-10 years following diagnosis and treatment for gynaecological cancer^{3,4}.
42 The main aims of follow-up include: detection of asymptomatic recurrences, with the
43 assumption that this will improve prognosis; detection and management of side effects of
44 treatment; improvement in quality of life; identification and treatment of patient concerns
45 and anxieties around their cancer diagnosis^{5,6}. However, there is no evidence that
46 intensive follow-up improves survival⁷⁻¹³ and women often find clinical examination
47 uncomfortable (especially vaginal examination) with 54% (48/89) experiencing increased
48 anxiety prior to their follow up appointments⁶.

49 There is evidence that the current hospital-based follow-up does not necessarily meet
50 cancer survivors needs, failing to provide emotional support and information needs¹⁴
51 due to limited time, resources and lack of focus on a holistic approach of the patients'
52 needs. A holistic approach will take account of mental and social factors as well as
53 symptoms of the disease. In 2010 the National Cancer Survivorship Initiative (NCSI) was
54 launched by the Department Of Health in England in collaboration with one of the UK's
55 largest charitable organisations, Macmillan Cancer Support, to improve the long term
56 consequences of surviving cancer¹⁵. In more recent years, the Living With and Beyond
57 Cancer programme¹⁶ has advocated a shift in care and support towards self-
58 management, based on individual needs and preferences, and away from the traditional
59 single model of clinical follow-up. This approach empowers individuals to take responsibility

Commented [M1]: Please modify all references to the style of the IJG. All superscript

Commented [NC2]: Ok. I have done this

60 for their condition, supported by clinical assessment to enable early recognition of
61 symptoms of recurrence or consequences of their treatment and a 'Recovery Package' that
62 includes holistic needs assessments (performed after completion of treatment for cancer),
63 treatment summaries, health and well-being events and cancer care reviews in primary
64 care¹⁶.

65 There are different [follow up](#) methods currently utilised in the UK which include hospital
66 [follow up](#), telephone [follow up](#) and PIFU. Hospital [follow up](#) involves seeing
67 patients in clinics at regular intervals, whereas telephone [follow up](#) involves calling
68 patients at a specified time at pre-determined intervals. PIFU involves educating patients
69 about concerning symptoms, such as vaginal bleeding, unintentional weight loss, and
70 worsening abdominal pain or bowel/bladder symptoms. In patient-initiated [follow up](#),
71 patients are not given routine [follow up](#) appointments (hospital, telephone or with [the](#)
72 [General practitioner](#)), but instead are empowered to call the gynaecological oncology
73 team directly (often via the clinical nurse specialist with specialist cancer knowledge) if they
74 have these symptoms and then they are fast-tracked back into the specialist care system. It
75 is very important that patients are given written information about PIFU, which includes the
76 contact details should they need them. Most patients find PIFU acceptable¹⁷, although
77 younger patients and those who struggle to access healthcare (due to socio-demographic
78 factors) may require the additional support¹⁸ of routine contact, either via hospital
79 [follow up](#) or telephone [follow up](#).

80 METHODS

81 The BGCS PIFU meeting was held on 14th March 2019 in London, UK. Experts from clinical
82 practice (including medicine and nursing) and academia with specialist knowledge and
83 expertise in [gynaecology](#) [oncology](#) and alternative [follow up](#) strategies reviewed
84 available evidence from a systematic literature search in Medline, Embase CINAHL, AMED,
85 BNI, HBE, HMIC, PsycINFO that aimed to identify significant evidence on alternatives to
86 hospital-based follow-up. These data were presented, discussed and evaluated by the key
87 opinion leaders. Additionally, data from a national survey of follow-up practice across the
88 UK in gynaecological malignancies were presented. All experts agreed the consensus

Commented [M3]: Please spell what this means

Commented [NC4]: done

89 guidelines for each gynaecological tumour site (cervical, ovarian, endometrial and
90 vulva).

91 Although there was no patient representative at the BGCS PIFU meeting, there has been
92 positive feedback from patients within the hospitals that have already implemented the
93 guidelines and in studies that looked at patient acceptability¹⁷⁻¹⁹
94 .
95

96 **DISCLAIMER**

97 Clinicians should always use their clinical judgement to determine if an individual patient is
98 suitable for PIFU. These consensus recommendations have been produced as guidance for
99 follow up pathways and are based on available evidence. Where little evidence existed,
100 expert consensus was agreed.

101 **RESULTS**

102 PIFU guidance for each cancer type will be presented separately under the general umbrella
103 and recommendation that only those patients who fit all of the criteria below are eligible
104 and safe to be offered PIFU:
105

General eligibility criteria for PIFU
Completed primary treatment for a gynaecological malignancy and are clinically well
Patients should be willing and able to access healthcare if on PIFU
They should be without significant treatment related side-effects that need ongoing management
They should not have recurrent disease
They should not be on active or maintenance treatment
They should not be on a clinical trial where follow-up schemes are defined and limited to hospital-based follow upFU
They should not have a rare tumour with uncertain risk of recurrence and need for ongoing management They must be able to communicate their concerns without a significant language barrier or psychological comorbidity and have competence to agree to PIFU

106

107 At the clinic visit prior to offering PIFU, patients should be provided with a careful
108 explanation on the lack of evidence for benefit from regular follow-up visits to the hospital
109 and the rationale for implementing a supported self-management approach (PIFU).
110 However, for patients with significant iatrogenic side effects, which impair their quality of
111 life and need active management, it is important that those are addressed and managed
112 within in the clinic setting with sufficient access to other health professionals, such as
113 gastroenterologists, urologists, endocrinologists, and psychologists. PIFU should be offered
114 on a case-by-case basis, ensuring there are no existing unmet needs and according to their
115 cancer type.

116 **ENDOMETRIAL CANCER**

117 There are approximately 9,300 new cases of endometrial cancer in the UK and it is the 4th
118 most common cancer in women²⁰. There has been an increase of nearly 20% in the last
119 10 years²⁰, which is thought to be largely due to the sharp increase in obesity, although
120 rarer tumours, not associated with obesity have also increased.

121 Low risk endometrial cancer is defined by the (European Society of Medical Oncology-
122 European Society of Gynecological Oncology) ESMO-ESGO guidelines²¹ as stage I
123 endometrioid, grade 1-2 histology, with ≤50% myometrial invasion, negative for
124 lymphovascular space invasion and hence not in need of adjuvant treatment²¹.
125 Following hysterectomy and bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy, patients have their
126 holistic needs assessment and the next steps of their journey discussed with their
127 dedicated cancer support workers, under the coordination and guidance of the clinical nurse
128 specialists. They can also be referred to psycho-oncological counselling services, if required
129 and accepted by the patient. Patients are educated about symptoms that would be
130 concerning for a recurrence, such as vaginal bleeding, worsening or persistent abdominal
131 pain, or bladder/bowel symptoms. A population study by Salvesen over 10 years
132 demonstrated that 653 patient consultations were needed to pick up one asymptomatic low
133 risk endometrial cancer patient with recurrent disease^{12,13}. Based on a very low risk
134 of relapse without adjuvant treatment, these patients could be offered PIFU after they have

Commented [M5]: Please note that neither of these references is the reference by Salvensen
Please adjust accordingly

Commented [NC6]: Apologies, I have changed it as its reference 12 and 13

completed treatment at, or shortly after, the time of their [holistic needs assessment](#) appointment (Figure 1).

Intermediate risk endometrial cancer is defined by the ESMO-ESGO guidelines²¹ as stage I endometrioid, grade 1–2, ≥50% myometrial invasion, [lymphovascular space invasion](#) negative. These patients are commonly offered vaginal brachytherapy, without external beam radiotherapy, following their hysterectomy²¹. Their risk of recurrence is relatively low. Patients could be offered PIFU at the 3-month review after treatment or anytime during the first 2 years of hospital [follow up](#). It is important for patients to be aware that they may develop late onset toxicity following brachytherapy that may not be apparent shortly after finishing their treatment. For that reason, it should be explained that they can be seen back in clinic, if they have concerns related to toxicity, as well as if they have symptoms concerning for recurrence, if they are on PIFU. Another option for these patients is telephone [follow up](#) with [randomised controlled trial](#) level data of no physical or psychological detriment, compared to hospital follow-up, in stage I endometrial cancer²². Telephone follow-up could be seen as a useful transition between face to face hospital-based appointments and PIFU.

High-intermediate risk endometrial cancer is defined by the ESMO-ESGO guidelines²¹ as patients with grade 1–2 tumours with deep (≥50%) myometrial invasion and unequivocally positive (substantial, not focal) [lymphovascular space invasion](#), and those with grade 3 tumours with <50% myometrial invasion regardless of [lymphovascular space invasion](#) status. These patients are treated as high risk for the purpose of these guidelines, due to their higher risk of recurrent disease. High-intermediate risk endometrial cancer represents a heterogeneous group of patients, including both endometrioid and non-endometrioid tumour types, such as serous and clear cell, and ranges from stage IB grade 3 (with or without [lymphovascular space invasion](#) and with or without nodal staging) to more advanced FIGO stages²¹. The risk of recurrence is higher for these patients (>20%) and therefore it is suggested that they should be seen in the clinic for at least the first 2 years, as this is the most frequent time for recurrence^{23,24}. After 2 years patients could be offered PIFU for the remaining 3 years (Figure 1). Again, another alternative is telephone [follow up](#) for the remaining 3 years.

Commented [M7]: Please spell

CERVICAL CANCER

There are approximately 3,200 new cases of cervical cancer every year, with an incidence of 12 per 100,000 in the UK²⁵.

In patients with a FIGO stage **IA1** cervical cancer the British Society of Colposcopy and Cervical Pathology (BSCCP) recommend cervical cytology should be taken 6 and 12 months after treatment (hysterectomy or LLETZ) followed by annual cytology for a further 9 years before returning to routine recall until the age of 65 for those treated with LLETZ and still have a cervix²⁷. If patients have had a hysterectomy for stage **IA1** cervical cancer there are specific guidelines on cytology follow-up depending on histology of the hysterectomy specimen²⁷. Patients who have had a hysterectomy for stage **IA1** are also excluded from PIFU.

In low risk patients (FIGO stage **IB1**) who have undergone a radical hysterectomy for treatment of cervical cancer the BGCS recommends follow-up in the clinic setting every 3-4 months in the first 2 years, and then PIFU can be offered (Figure 2). It should be noted that the BSCCP recommends vault smears at 6 and 18 months after a hysterectomy for cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN)²⁷ if margins are free of CIN. However, vaginal vault cytology should not be performed following treatment for FIGO stage **≥IA2** as it does not add significantly to the detection of recurrent disease^{25, 27-28}. These patients have a 5-year risk of recurrence of 5.8-8%^{27, 29-31}. However only 4-5% will have pelvic recurrences and only 1-2% can be salvaged^{28, 31, 32}, although this has increased slightly with cyberknife and other techniques. In a large Danish national cohort study of 1523 patients with low-risk cervical cancer, of those with recurrent disease, 67.5% experienced a symptomatic recurrence³⁰. Other studies have shown similar rates of symptomatic recurrent cervical cancer²⁴. Therefore, as the majority present with symptoms, PIFU appears to be reasonable for low-risk patients. As surgery for early stage cervical cancer may cause morbidity, such as bladder dysfunction and lymphoedema, hospital **follow up** for the first 2 years was thought to be preferable to telephone **follow up** (BGCS consensus agreement).

In patients with intermediate (risk of recurrence 10-20%) or high risk (risk of recurrence >20%) disease, hospital **follow up**, to include taking an appropriate history and clinical

195 examination at each visit, should be undertaken to try and detect recurrent disease. This
196 group of patients usually have FIGO stage \geq IB2, although there are other factors that play
197 a role in the likelihood of recurrence, such as lymph node status and [lymphovascular space](#)
198 [invasion](#)³⁰. Hospital [follow up](#) should be undertaken for 5 years, particularly as
199 these patients may have significant treatment-related toxicity (Figure 2). However, it
200 should be noted that the majority of recurrences occur within 2 years; a Norwegian national
201 prospective observational study by Vistad et al. in 2017, which included 680 patients with
202 gynaecological cancer recurrence, showed a mean annual incidence rate from years 3-5 of
203 only <7%³⁰.

204 OVARIAN CANCER

205 There were 7,500 women who developed tubo-ovarian/primary peritoneal cancer in the UK
206 in 2016 making it the 6th most common cancer in women³⁴. The majority of those who
207 developed tubo-ovarian/primary peritoneal cancer had epithelial ovarian cancer,
208 which relates to these guidelines. Non-epithelial ovarian cancers, such as granulosa cell
209 tumours or germ cell tumours of the ovary, are not included in these guidelines, as they
210 have their own distinct pathogenesis and behave differently [from epithelial ovarian](#)
211 [cancer](#). Fertility-preserving surgery, that includes a unilateral salpingo-oophorectomy
212 and full surgical staging, is acceptable in young patients with stage IA (grade 1 and 2), and
213 stage IC (grade 1) disease, as they have similar recurrence rates and overall survival to
214 those undergoing conventional treatment³⁵. However, these patients should be seen
215 regularly for hospital [follow up](#) and ultrasound scans of the contralateral ovary and
216 are excluded from PIFU.

217 Only patients who have been adequately staged, with pelvic and para-aortic
218 lymphadenectomy and peritoneal biopsies for an apparent stage I ovarian cancer, should
219 be offered PIFU, so that occult higher stage cancers with higher risk of relapse, are not
220 included³⁶. Patients with fully staged IA/B ovarian cancer (of any grade) have a low
221 risk of recurrence and therefore could be offered PIFU after they have completed their
222 treatment (Figure 3). Evidence does not suggest that routine follow-up of patients with
223 ovarian cancer improves survival³⁷⁻⁴⁰. A randomised phase III study OV05-EORTC
224 55955⁴⁰, which compared initiation of chemotherapy on development of elevated

CA125 versus initiation of chemotherapy on clinical/symptomatic evidence of relapse showed treatment was delayed by a median of 4.8 months in the latter group with no detriment to overall survival (HR 1.01; 95% CI 0.82–1.25; P = 0.91). Moreover, quality of life was lower in the patients that had initiation of chemotherapy on CA125 rise. However, this study took place outside the possibility of secondary cytoreductive surgery for recurrent ovarian cancer and also before the establishment of targeted and maintenance agents at relapsed disease and it is unclear whether we can translate its findings to the modern era of ovarian cancer management^{36,42}.

At the follow-up appointment, symptoms should be assessed and a physical examination should be carried out in the first 3 years from completing treatment in patients with FIGO stage 2-4, as this is the most common time period in which recurrent disease develops³⁰. In years 4 and 5, in the absence of recurrent disease, patients could have the option of moving to a combination of telephone [follow up](#) with CA125 serial measurements, if deemed suitable by their clinician. There is evidence that telephone [follow up](#) in ovarian cancer is well received and the majority preferred it to hospital [follow up](#)⁴³. If patients are not suitable for telephone [follow up](#) and remote CA125 measurements, patients should continue hospital [follow up](#) for a minimum of 5 years after completing treatment.

VULVAR CANCER

Vulvar cancer is rare with only 1,300 new cases in 2015 in the UK, which is less than 1% of all cancers in women⁴⁴. Cancer of the vulva primarily affects older women with the highest incidence of women aged 90 or over⁴⁴. The difficulty of self-examination and the increased numbers of cases in deprived areas⁴⁴ leads to a greater number of vulnerable women. Therefore, the BGCS recommends that women with vulvar cancer are not suitable for PIFU (Figure 4) and should follow the traditional [follow up](#) schemes involving careful clinical examination. This should be performed by clinicians with appropriate experience, which would usually be in the hospital setting.

There is no evidence for the recommendations of frequency of examinations. The ESGO expert consensus guidelines and RCOG guidelines on vulvar cancer⁴⁵ recommend 3-4 monthly follow-up in the first 2 years, biannually for years 3 and 4 and then [annual](#) [life-long](#)

255 follow-up. This is supported by a retrospective analysis of 330 patients with primary vulvar
256 carcinoma treated at the Mayo clinic, which showed 35% of recurrences occurred more
257 than 5 years after diagnosis with both distant and local disease⁴⁶. The BGCS
258 recommends follow up of patients with vulval cancer for at least 5 years, with longer
259 follow-up at the discretion of the treating clinician. Patients with multi-focal vulvar
260 intraepithelial neoplasia (VIN) or lichen sclerosis with VIN (differentiated VIN) are at high
261 risk of multi-focal disease and more intensive follow-up may be warranted^{45, 47}.

Commented [M10]: Here, do you mean annually? Please specify

Commented [NC11]: Yes. I have added in 'annual'

263 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

264 We would like to thank Debbie Lewis for her help in organising the BGCS PIFU meeting.

265 COMPETING INTERESTS

266 None

267 ETHICS

268 No ethical review was necessary as this is a review article and therefore we did not use any
269 human participants for this piece of research.

271 FUNDING

272 All costs relating to the BGCS guideline meeting on patien- initiated follow-up were covered
273 by BGCS funds.

274

Endometrial Cancer	Clinic-based FU	Telephone FU +/- blood test	PIFU
Low risk (<10% risk of recurrence ROR)	If patient declines PIFU (for maximum of 2 years from end of treatment)	If patient declines PIFU (for maximum of 2 years from end of treatment)	Offer from end of treatment (after Holistic needs assessment at 3 months)
Intermediate risk	Can be offered if declines PIFU for 2 years from end of treatment	Can be offered if declines PIFU for 2 years from end of treatment	offer from end of treatment or after 2 years for all
High -intermediate risk	For 5 years (either telephone FU or clinic FU)	For 5 years (either telephone FU or clinic FU)	offer from 2 years from end of treatment in place of telephone FU or clinic FU.
High-risk	For 5 years (either telephone FU or clinic FU)	For 5 years (either telephone FU or clinic FU)	offer from 2 years from end of treatment in place of telephone FU or clinic FU.

Figure 1: Guidelines for follow-up in eEndometrial cancer
(ROR=risk of recurrence, PIFU= patient initiated follow-up, FU=follow-up)

281

Cervical Cancer	Clinic-based FU	Telephone FU +/- blood test	PIFU
Low risk (<10% risk of recurrence ROR) excluding fertility sparing surgery/ LLETZ	For 5 years post completion of treatment	Not suitable	Offer from 2 years from end of treatment
Intermediate risk	For 5 years post completion of treatment	Not suitable	Not suitable
High risk	For 5 years post completion of treatment	Not suitable	Not suitable

282

283

284

285

286

Figure 2: Guidelines for follow-up in cervical cancer (ROR=risk of recurrence, PIFU= patient initiated follow-up, LLETZ= large loop excision of transformation zone, FU=follow-up).)

287

Ovarian Cancer	Clinic-based FU	Telephone FU +/- blood test	PIFU
Low risk (<10% risk of recurrence ROR, stage 1a/b fully staged) from end of treatment (surgery +/-chemo). Excluding fertility sparing surgery	Can be offered if declines PIFU for 2 years from end of treatment	Can be offered if declines PIFU for 2 years from end of treatment	Offer from end of treatment (after Holistic needs assessment at 3 months)
FIGO stages 1c-4	For 3 years from end of treatment	Can be offered for years 4+5 from end of treatment	Not suitable

288

289

290

291

Figure 3: Guidelines for follow-up in govarian cancer
(ROR=risk of recurrence, PIFU= patient initiated follow-up, FU=follow-up)

Options for follow-up	Vulval Cancer
PIFU for 5 years from treatment	Not suitable
Remote/telephone +/- bloods	Not suitable
Clinic-based FU	Follow-up including clinical inspection for at least 5 years from from end of treatment

Figure 4: Guidelines for follow-up in ~~v~~ulvar ~~r~~-cancer
(FU=follow-up, PIFU= patient initiated follow-up)

REFERENCES

1. Leeson S, Stuart N, Sylvestre Y, Hall L, Whitaker R. Gynaecological cancer follow-up: national survey of current practice in the UK. *BMJ Open* 2013 Jul 24;3(7). pii: e002859. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002859.
2. Watson E, Rose P, Hulbert-williams N, Donnelly P, Hubbard G, Elliot J, Campbell C, Wellers D, Wilkinson C. Personalised cancer follow-up: risk stratification, needs assessment or both? *British Journal of Cancer* 2012;106:1–5
3. Kew FM, Cruickshank DJ. Routine follow-up after treatment for a gynaecological cancer: a survey of practice. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2006;16:380–4.
4. <https://www.bgcs.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/BGCS-patient-initiated-followup-consensus-outcomes-sumary-final.vs3587.pdf>. Accessed December 2019.
5. Kerr-Wilson RH, McCrum A. Follow-up of patients with gynaecological cancer. *Aust NZ J Obstet Gynaecol* 1995;35:298–9.
6. Kew FM, Galaal K, Manderville H, et al. Professionals' and patients' views of routine follow-up: a questionnaire survey. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2007;17:557–60.
7. Agboola O, Grunfeld E, Coyle D, et al. Costs and benefits of routine follow-up after curative treatment for endometrial cancer. *Can Med Assoc J* 1997;157:879–86.
8. Allsop JR, Preston J, Crocker S. Is there any value in the long-term follow-up of women treated for endometrial cancer? *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1997;104:122.
9. Gadducci A, Cosio S, Fanucchi A, et al. An intensive follow-up does not change survival of patients with clinical stage I endometrial cancer. *Anticancer Res* 2000;20:1977–84.
10. Owen P, Duncan ID. Is there any value in the long-term follow-up of women treated for endometrial cancer? *Br J Obstet Gynecol* 1996;103:710–13.
11. Reddoch JM, Burke TW, Morris M, et al. Surveillance for recurrent endometrial carcinoma: development of a follow-up scheme. *Gynecol Oncol* 1995;59:221–5.
12. Salvesen HB, Akslen LA, Iversen T, et al. Recurrence of endometrial carcinoma and the value of follow-up. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1997;104:1302–7.
13. Fung-Kee-Fung, M., Dodge, J., Elit, L., Lukka, H., Chambers, A., Oliver, T. Follow-up after primary therapy for endometrial cancer: a systematic review. *Gynecologic Oncology* 2006;101:520-529.

14. Sperling C, Sandager M, Jensen H, Knudsen JL. Current organisation of follow-up does not meet cancer patients' needs. *Dan Med J* 2014;61(6):A4855
15. Department of Health 2011. Improving outcomes: a strategy for cancer .
http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_123371. Accessed December 2019.
16. Living with and beyond cancer 2013.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/living-with-and-beyond-cancer-taking-action-to-improve-outcomes>. Accessed December 2019.
17. Beaver K¹, Martin-Hirsch P², Williamson S³, Kyrgiou M⁴ Exploring the acceptability and feasibility of patient-initiated follow-up for women treated for stage I endometrial cancer. *Eur J Oncol Nurs*. 2019 Nov 28;44:101704. doi: 10.1016/j.ejon.2019.101704.
18. Kumarakulasingam P¹, McDermott H², Patel N³, Boutler L³, Tincello DG⁴, Peel D³, Moss EL¹ Acceptability and utilisation of patient-initiated follow-up for endometrial cancer amongst women from diverse ethnic and social backgrounds: A mixed methods study. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2019 Mar;28(2):e12997. doi: 10.1111/ecc.12997. Epub 2019 Feb 12
19. Jeppesen MM^{1,2}, Jensen PT^{1,2}, Hansen DG³, Christensen RD⁴, Mogensen O² Patient-initiated follow up affects fear of recurrence and healthcare use: a randomised trial in early-stage endometrial cancer. *BJOG*. 2018 Dec;125(13):1705-1714. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.15396
20. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/uterine-cancer#heading-Zero>. Accessed December 2019
21. Colombo N, Creutzberg C, Amant F, et al. ESMO–ESGO–ESTRO consensus conference on endometrial cancer: diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Radiother Oncol* 2015; 117: 559–81.
22. Beaver K¹, Williamson S¹, Sutton C², Hollingworth W³, Gardner A⁴, Allton B⁵, Abdel-Aty M⁶, Blackwood K⁷, Burns S⁷, Curwen D⁸, Ghani R⁵, Keating P⁹, Murray S⁹, Tomlinson A¹⁰, Walker B⁶, Willett M⁶, Wood N⁹, Martin-Hirsch P⁹. Comparing hospital

- and telephone follow-up for patients treated for stage-I endometrial cancer (ENDCAT trial): a randomised, multicentre, non-inferiority trial. *BJOG* 2017 124(1):150-160. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.14000. Epub 2016 Apr 7.
23. de Boer S, Melanie E Powell, Linda Mileschkin, Dionyssios Katsaros, Paul Bessette, Christine Haie-Meder, Petronella B Ottevanger, Jonathan A Ledermann, Pearly Khaw, Romerai D'Amico, Anthony Fyles, Marie-Helene Baron, Ina M Jürgenliemk-Schulz, Henry C Kitchener, Hans W Nijman, Godfrey Wilson, Susan Brooks, Sergio Gribaudo, Diane Provencher, Chantal Hanzen, Roy F Kruitwagen, Vincent T H B M Smit, Naveena Singh, Viet Do, Andrea Lissoni, Remi A Nout, Amanda Feeney, Karen W Verhoeven-Adema, Hein Putter, Carien L Creutzberg, on behalf of the PORTEC Study Group* Adjuvant chemoradiotherapy versus radiotherapy alone in women with high-risk endometrial cancer (PORTEC-3): patterns of recurrence and post-hoc survival analysis of a randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2019; 20: 1273–85
24. Vistad I¹, Bjørge L^{2,3,4}, Solheim O⁵, Fiane B⁶, Sachse K⁷, Tjugum J⁸, Skrøppa S⁹, Bentzen AG¹⁰, Stokstad T¹¹, Iversen GA², Salvesen HB², Kristensen GB^{5,12}, Dørum A⁵ A national, prospective observational study of first recurrence after primary treatment for gynecological cancer in Norway. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2017 Oct;96(10):1162-1169. doi: 10.1111/aogs.13199
25. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/cervical-cancer> Accessed December 2019
26. Colposcopy and programme management. NHCSP publication 20, Public health England. Third edition 2016
27. Cibula D¹, Pötter R², Planchamp F³, Avall-Lundqvist E⁴, Fischerova D⁵, Haie-Meder C⁶, Köhler C⁷, Landoni F⁸, Lax S⁹, Lindegaard JC¹⁰, Mahantshetty U¹¹, Mathevet P¹², McCluggage WG¹³, McCormack M¹⁴, Naik R¹⁵, Nout R¹⁶, Pignata S¹⁷, Ponce J¹⁸, Querleu D³, Raspagliesi F¹⁹, Rodolakis A²⁰, Tamussino K²¹, Wimberger P²², Raspollini MR²³ The European Society of Gynaecological Oncology/European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology/European Society of Pathology Guidelines for the Management of Patients with Cervical Cancer. *Virchows Arch* 2018 Jun;472(6):919-936. doi: 10.1007/s00428-018-2362-9. Epub 2018 May.
28. Caleia A, Pires C, Pereira J, Pinto-Ribeiro F, Longatto-filo A. Self sampling as a plausible alternative to screen cervical cancer precursor lesions in a population with

- low attendance for screening: a systematic review. *Acta Cytol.* 2020 Jan 20;1-12. doi: 10.1159/000505121.
29. Elit L, Fyles A, Devries M, Oliver T, Michael Fung-Kee-Fung and The Gynecology Cancer Disease Site Group. Follow-up for women after treatment for cervical cancer: A systematic review. *Gynaecol Oncol.* 2009 Sep;114(3):528-35. doi: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2009.06.001. Epub 2009 Jun 26.
 30. Taarnhøj G, Christensen J, Lajer H, Fuglsang K, Jeppesen M M, Strøm K, Høgdall C. Risk of recurrence, prognosis, and follow-up for Danish women with cervical cancer in 2005-2013: A national cohort study. *Cancer.* 2018 Mar 1;124(5):943-951. doi: 10.1002/cncr.31165. Epub 2017 Dec 6.
 31. Srisomboon J, Kietpeerakool C, Suprasert P, et al. Survival and prognostic factors comparing stage IB 1 versus stage IB 2 cervical cancer treated with primary radical hysterectomy. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2011;12:1753-1756.
 32. Friedlander M, Grogan M. Guidelines for the treatment of recurrent and metastatic cervical cancer. *Oncologist.* 2002;7:342-347.
 33. Mabuchi S, Isohashi F, Yoshioka Y, et al. Prognostic factors for survival in patients with recurrent cervical cancer previously treated with radiotherapy. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2010;20:834-840.
 34. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/ovarian-cancer>. Accessed December 2019.
 35. Bentivegna E, Gouy S, Maulard A et al. Fertility-sparing surgery in epithelial ovarian cancer: a systematic review of oncological issues. *Ann Oncol* 2016; 27(11): 1994–2004.
 36. Colombo, C. Sessa, A. du Bois, J. Ledermann, W. G. McCluggage, I. McNeish, P. Morice, S. Pignata, I. Ray-Coquard, I. Vergote, T. Baert, I. Belaroussi, A. Dashora, S. Olbrecht, F. Planchamp & D. Querleu. ESMO–ESGO Consensus Conference Recommendations on Ovarian Cancer: Pathology and Molecular Biology, Early and Advanced Stages, Borderline Tumours and Recurrent Disease. *Ann Oncol* 2019; 30: 672-705.
 37. Clarke T, Galaal K, Bryant A, Naik R. Evaluation of follow-up strategies for patients with epithelial ovarian cancer following completion of primary treatment. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; (9):CD006119.

38. Geurts SM, de Vegt F, van Altena AM et al. Considering early detection of relapsed ovarian cancer: a review of the literature. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2011; 21(5): 837–845.
39. Geurts SM, de Vegt F, van Altena AM et al. Impact of routine follow-up examinations on life expectancy in ovarian cancer patients: a simulation study. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2012; 22(7): 1150–1157.
40. Geurts SM, van Altena AM, de Vegt F et al. No supportive evidence for clinical benefit of routine follow-up in ovarian cancer: a Dutch multicenter study. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2011; 21(4): 647–653.
41. Rustin GJ, van der Burg ME, on behalf of MRC and EORTC collaborators. A randomized trial in ovarian cancer (OC) of early treatment of relapse based on CA125 level alone versus delayed treatment based on conventional clinical indicators (MRC OV05/EORTC 55955 trials). *J Clin Oncol (Meeting Abstracts)* 2009; 27(18s): 1
42. Pujade-Lauraine E¹, Ledermann JA², Selle F³, Gebbski V⁴, Penson RT⁵, Oza AM⁶, Korach J⁷, Huzarski T⁸, Poveda A⁹, Pignata S¹⁰, Friedlander M¹¹, Colombo N¹², Harter P¹³, Fujiwara K¹⁴, Ray-Coquard I¹⁵, Banerjee S¹⁶, Liu J¹⁷, Lowe ES¹⁸, Bloomfield R¹⁹, Pautier P²⁰; SOLO2/ENGOT-Ov21 investigators. Olaparib tablets as maintenance therapy in patients with platinum-sensitive, relapsed ovarian cancer and a BRCA1/2 mutation (SOLO2/ENGOT-Ov21): a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2017 Sep;18(9):1274-1284. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30469-2. Epub 2017 Jul 25.
43. Cox a, Ellen Bull b, Jane Cockle-Hearne a, Wendy Knibb a, Claire Potter a, Sara Faithfull. Nurse led telephone follow-up in ovarian cancer: A psychosocial perspective. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing* 12 (2008) 412–417.
44. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/vulval-cancer>. Accessed December 2019
45. RCOG. Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Vulval Carcinoma. <https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelinesresearch-services/guidelines/vulvalcarcinoma-guidelines-for-the-diagnosisand-management-of/> (2014). Accessed December 2019
46. Gonzalez Bosquet J¹, Magrina JF, Gaffey TA, Hernandez JL, Webb MJ, Cliby WA, Podratz KC. Long-term survival and disease recurrence in patients with primary squamous cell carcinoma of the vulva. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2005 Jun;97(3):828-33.

47. <https://guidelines.esgo.org/vulvar-cancer/guidelines/recommendations/>. Accessed
December 2019